

Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the video printer in group II does not require the method of teaching detection and control in group III to be operative. Claim 10 specifically recites "rotation detection means ..." and "control means for determining ..." that perform functions similar to that taught in method Claim 15 via "detecting ...," and "determining ..." steps.

Furthermore, under MPEP 803, restriction is not proper unless a serious burden is imposed on the Examiner. Here, Group II is embodied in a video printer with a paper spool and detection portion, and Group III is a paper spool and detecting means formatted in a method claim. Therefore each group contains similar subject matter that lends itself to simultaneous examination that is believed would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request combination, and election of combined Groups II and III. Alternatively, if the Examiner does not agree with the above remarks, Applicants request election of Group II.

Consequently, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and it is respectfully submitted that this case is ready for examination. An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Crosby, Heafey, Roach & May
A Professional Corporation

Dated: October 25, 2001

Two Embarcadero Center
Suite 2000
PO Box 7936
San Francisco, CA 94120-7936
Direct Dial (415) 659-5927
(415) 391-8269 Facsimile

By: 

Name: John W. Carpenter
Registration No. 39,129
Attorney for Applicant